

we might resolve and resolve that we would not dissolve but we would dissolve just the same, if the King's representative, with or without the advice of his cabinet, saw fit to dissolve this parliament. So that I say there are no statements that agree. If we are his loyal subjects, we cannot say that he has no more rights than are allowed him by this parliament, and to say so is an assault, and nothing less than an assault, on the King's constitutional right in this country. Then the right hon. gentleman adds:

If there is a nation under the sun that can say more than this, where is it to be found?

And by that he means that we are as independent of Great Britain and her King as any other nation under the sun. If he does not mean that, his words are without meaning, or else language has been given the right hon. gentleman, as Talleyrand said, to conceal his thoughts. If that be the case, then what a sinful profusion there has been in the case of the right hon. and learned gentleman, who has two living languages, and, no doubt, several dead ones, in which to conceal the most disloyal and unconstitutional thoughts in regard to the relations of Canada and the motherland that have ever been entertained by any public man in Canada.

But, to return to the right hon. gentleman's statement, I think I told you that fifteen out of twenty-seven pages were devoted to the subjects I enumerated. The remaining part of the speech is addressed to Quebec. Again, with painful reiteration he trots out the Plains of Abraham—Lord Durham—Lafontaine—Papineau—Lafontaine again—Baldwin. What has Peter the Hermit done? When addressing his people in Quebec, the right hon. gentleman says nothing about Peter the Hermit. And he winds up by saying that these names and these events are his supreme inspiration in turning this page of the history of Canada. Incidentally, however, he drops a hint that may be taken as a reference in some way to the Navy Bill. He drops a hint that this little Canadian navy is to go to England's wars only if Canada is attacked. He points out that this navy will be to Canada just what the police are to Montreal, and he hints, not obscurely, that this navy is fitted and intended to be of just as much service in one of the naval wars of the empire, as a policeman of Montreal is fitted or intended to command a battleship in such a war.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. COWAN. I have heard from the fringe. I am very glad to hear from the fringe,—delighted that they appreciate that sentiment, and that they let us know what their sentiment is. Perhaps I can learn further that they too, like the right hon. Prime Minister, have a goal for their as-

pirations. I wonder if my hon. friend who called out, 'hear, hear', regards the independence of Canada as the goal of his aspirations. I wonder if my hon. friend who called out, 'hear, hear', means by that that the Canadian navy is not to join in the wars of the empire except when Canada is attacked. I wonder if he means by that that the Canadian navy is not fitted or intended to be of any more service in a naval war of the empire than a policeman is fitted or intended to command a battleship in such a war. Perhaps the hon. gentleman who said, 'Hear, hear' will be good enough to tell us.

This, then, is the speech, and the whole speech, of the right hon. the Prime Minister of Canada. Let us turn then, to the next in order. Let us turn from the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux)—again from Jove to a satellite of Jove. As that gentleman attitudinized and swelled to his theme, he led this House to expect one of those performances described in the play-bills as 'imitations of popular performers.' And let me assure the hon. gentleman that his audience on that occasion was not disappointed. But let me tell the hon. Postmaster General that the malignant indelicacy of his reference and allusion to the distinguished and noble ancestry of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) did but little credit to himself and did injustice to the people of Quebec. Because that reference, that allusion, could be made only on one assumption—namely, that a distinguished and noble ancestry unfitted a man for public life in Quebec.

Let me tell the hon. gentleman also that he did not, to my mind, illumine this subject of the navy to any marked extent, by dwelling at such length and with such particularity on his own personal history and ambition, but when he reached that point of self-inflation where he declared he was the knight of labour in this House, well, Mr. Speaker, I did pity the Minister of Labour and the member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith). But I recollected the attitude of all these gentlemen towards technical education and the Eight Hour Bill, and I was ready to concede that the Postmaster General was not only the (k)night, but the Egyptian darkness of labour in Canada. Well, then, the hon. gentleman, leaving the entrancing subject of his own personal importance and by natural sequence and in further illumination of the subject of the navy, he recalled the guillotine and Madame Roland and then exploded in this apastrophe, 'Oh loyalty what crimes are committed in thy name.' Whereupon, by a trick of memory, I was translated in imagination away from this Chamber and its stifling atmosphere, away to the sunny slopes of the broad Pacific, where last fall on the banks of the Fraser